

# **SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD**

## **SUMMARY MINUTES - REGULAR MEETING**

September 30 - October 1, 1999  
9:00 a.m.

City Council Chambers  
Vancouver, Washington

### ***SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:***

|                            |   |
|----------------------------|---|
| William Ruckelshaus, Chair | Seattle                                     |
| Larry Cassidy              | Vancouver                                   |
| Brenda McMurray            | Yakima                                      |
| James Peters               | Shelton (arrived at 10:30 a.m.)             |
| John Roskelley             | Spokane                                     |
| Steve Meyer                | Executive Director, Conservation Commission |
| Tom Eaton                  | Designee, Department of Ecology             |
| Jeff Koenings              | Director, Department of Fish and Wildlife   |
| Craig Partridge            | Designee, Department of Natural Resources   |
| Jerry Alb                  | Designee, Department of Transportation      |

---

*A verbatim recorded tape of the meeting's proceedings is retained by IAC as the formal record of the meeting.*

### **WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

Chair Ruckelshaus called the meeting to order at 9:00 and welcomed members of the board and the audience.

Royce Pollard, Mayor, City of Vancouver, welcomed the Board to the City of Vancouver and Clark County. He thanked members for taking on a difficult and important assignment and asked the Board to consider the role of urban areas as funding priorities are discussed.

Betty Sue Morris, Clark County Commissioner, welcomed Board members and provided a brief description of the afternoon tour.

Chair Ruckelshaus reviewed Board actions to date, and briefly discussed the meeting agenda. At a retreat on September 15, 1999 the Board discussed the scope of its authority and responsibilities. After further discussion today, the scope and grant application criteria will be published, and public comment will be solicited during the month of October.

Members of the Board were asked to submit comments regarding the August 20, 1999 meeting minutes to the IAC staff; approval will be at the October or November meeting.

## Management and Status Reports

Director Laura Johnson noted that CVTV will be videotaping the proceedings for the next two days and tapes will be available for public review. In addition, the IAC website will contain the public documents mentioned above.

Director Johnson reminded the Board that approximately \$23 million in state funds is available for distribution. In addition, the Board has authority to spend any federal funds – estimated to be \$20-25 million – which may come to the state.

She suggested that SRFB meetings begin with management reports which can provide a broad overview of staff activities. Debra Wilhelmi will present a financial update (how much money has been spent, how many grants that represents and how much uncommitted funding is available). Staff will establish a mailing cut-off date all meetings and Board members are encouraged to suggest other reports or alternate formats for clarity.

Debra Wilhelmi reviewed the financial and management services memo provided in the meeting materials. Larry Cassidy asked that Bonneville Ratepayer projects, funded by the Northwest Power Planning Council (NWPPC) be added to the list of “Agencies with Specific Salmon-Related Appropriations, 1999 Session”.

Jeff Koenings asked staff to provide qualifying information regarding the development status of individual projects.

Effective September 30, the day-to-day management of projects funded with federal dollars will shift to IAC from the Governor’s Salmon Recovery Office. These projects will be reported as part of the SRFB portfolio.

Chair Ruckelshaus reported that Washington State should receive about \$4 million from Congressional appropriation to the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation. The grants must be matched on a 2/1 basis which will provide \$12 million in value. He suggested those projects also be reflected in the financial report.

Director Johnson agreed to periodically report the activities of the Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board (OWEB) which will also be working on salmon recovery.

Debra Wilhelmi provided a brief demonstration of the IAC grant management system - PRISM - and highlighted some of the methods which will be used to track salmon related projects. Director Johnson pointed out that PRISM is not an environmental monitoring system (i.e. benefits to the fish cannot be measured). However, staff is working with the Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) and the Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission to assure that information gathered is compatible with monitoring systems such as SHHIAP.

Larry Cassidy asked staff to work with the NWPPC for information on the province, basin and sub-basin system.

## **SRFB MISSION AND SCOPE OF WORK**

Chair Ruckelshaus announced that staff has been very active developing grant criteria and clarifying the scope of the Board's authority. It has been necessary to move forward quickly so that draft documents can go out for public comment in October. The Board plans to approve the scope and criteria documents at the November 17<sup>th</sup> meeting in order to have a grant schedule which would culminate in March, 2000.

Jim Kramer and Jim Fox facilitated a discussion of the Board's Mission and Scope of Work and Habitat Project Grant Making documents (see Appendix A for documents as revised after Board discussion). Mr. Fox announced that three public comment workshops had been scheduled - Yakima (October 14), Mt. Vernon (October 21) and Olympia (October 26) – and comments on the public notification process that will be used for the public comment workshops. Public comments will also be solicited via mail and email.

Chair Ruckelshaus called for public testimony:

Jay Watson                      Executive Director, Hood Canal Coordinating Council  
Urged the Board to carefully consider geographic groupings (lead entities, ESUs, etc.) which, in several instances, are conflicting. He stressed the importance of consistency in the terms that are used in the documents.

John Roskelly asked staff to prepare maps and overlays showing ESUs, county boundaries, WRIAs, recovery regions, etc. to get a clearer vision of the overlapping which currently exist.

Michael Kaputa                Salmon Recovery Coordinator, Chelan County and the Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board  
Urged the Board to reconsider the location of the Eastern Washington public workshop session since Yakima is such a distance from the most of the Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery area.

The meeting was recessed for Board members to participate in a tour coordinated by the Lower Columbia Salmon Recovery Board.

### **Friday, October 1, 1999**

Chair Ruckelshaus reconvened the meeting and reviewed the remainder of the agenda. Director Johnson introduced newly appointed SRFB Assistant Attorney General, Nancy Krier. She also announced that a presentation on limiting factors will be on the October 15 agenda in Yakima.

The Chair reminded Board members of the need to adopt a scientific screening process to assure that the applications for funding are as scientifically sound and technically correct as possible. In addition, it will be necessary to distinguish between science and policy.

## **OVERVIEW OF CO-MANAGERS SALMON RECOVERY ACTIVITIES AND BRIEFINGS BY SCIENCE GROUPS; LOCAL, REGIONAL AND STATEWIDE**

Tim Smith, WDFW, discussed the agenda for the “Role of Science in Salmon Recovery” agenda item (see meeting materials).

### **Background on Co-Management**

Panelists Jay Geck (AAG), Billy Frank (NW Indian Fisheries Commission), Terry Williams (Tulalip Tribe) and Larry Peck (Deputy Director, WDFW) provided legal history and background information on co-management.

### **Overview of Co-Managers Salmon Recovery Activities**

Panelists Terry Wright (NW Indian Fisheries Commission) and Jim Scott (WDFW) reviewed the Co-Management Salmon Recovery Approach, the development of interim recovery goals and the status of Puget Sound salmon recovery plans (see meeting materials for further information).

### **Board Comments and Questions:**

Q: How is the perceived historic level of salmon runs determined?

A: There really isn't a “historic number” but scientists will identify what they feel is a reasonable starting place. Although experts do not presume that pristine, historic levels can be recovered, they hope to make significant moves toward that level.

Q: Please provide further information regarding “United States vs. Oregon”.

A: The parties involved (treaty tribes on the Columbia River, Oregon, Idaho and Washington and the United State) have worked together under a plan for a number of years. The plan has expired and the parties are attempting to renegotiate that plan. Simultaneously, the parties are looking at production needs for upriver (an essential component of the discussions given the mortality associated with the dams), and the National Marine Fish Service (NMFS) is developing guidelines to determine what the Endangered Species Act (ESA) requires for fish upriver. The parties are earnestly working to renegotiate the fishing plans, but efforts are complicated by the upriver production needs and by the ESA.

Q: Has NMFS been involved in the development of the goals discussed?

A: There has been some NMFS participation in local watershed planning processes. They have become more active and have been interacting at the local, regional, state and national levels.

Chair Ruckelshaus stated that it is important to determine precisely how those numerical goals will be decided (smolt, escapement, etc.). The SRFB will soon approve funding criteria and application guidelines. Without a clear goal, it will be difficult to allocate funds to projects which will be most effective and provide the most benefit to the salmon. It is very important that the scientists and policy makers and enforcers continue to interact as the process moves forward.

Q: Is it possible for science to determine what percentage of an important habitat area needs to be improved for that area to function at an effective level?

A: There is a tremendous gap between existing numbers of smolts vs. desired numbers. Hopefully, projects funded by the SRFB will help close that gap.

### **Implementing Science:**

Panelists addressed various issues dealing with the implementation of science:

|              |                               |                                   |
|--------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Kit Rawson   | Tulalip Tribes                | Science at the Watershed Level    |
| Chris Weller | Point-No-Point Treaty Council | Science at the Regional Level     |
| Pete Bisson  | USFS - PNW Research           | Independent Science Review Team   |
| Ken Currens  | Acting Chair                  | Independent Science Panel         |
| Robin Waples | NW Fisheries Science Center   | NMFS Recovery Planning Strategies |
| Tim Smith    | WDFW                          | Critical Tools                    |

### **Board Comments and Questions:**

Q: How the escapement goal was established back in the 1960s?

A: An interim goal is the average over the years. The "down" years (1968-78) probably resulted from harvest rates that were set too high considering that ocean survival was declining.

Q: Has the NW Power Planning Council set standards for what constitutes adequate watershed assessment?

A: No. However, they are working what would be the common elements of sound watershed assessment. The Willamette Basin has a plan funded by the EPA through a project called PNW Eco-Region Cooperative which is an excellent model. The Nisqually is also a good plan.

Chair Ruckelshaus requested the Independent Science Panel's help in 1) establishing the project screening process, 2) providing a broader framework, 3) distinguishing between science and policy.

Robin Waples, NW Fisheries Science Center, offered to provide scientific input on: 1) establishment of the ecological principles the SRFB would use to guide the effort (either help developing the draft or commenting on the draft); and, 2) the criteria for funding proposals. Waples reported that it would not appropriate for the group to review individual projects.

## **Critical Needs**

Tim Smith reviewed the information which had been presented by the panelists (see meeting materials) and explained how analysis and monitoring projects are critical and have a fundamental application to recovery activities. He invited panelists to answer Board questions.

Q: What can be done to avoid duplication so that watershed assessments are done only once and are done adequately?

A: Stronger and more assertive leadership from the top. It is important to have recognition from higher political levels that activities need to be better coordinated and integrated into the various agencies and organizations.

After a lunch break, Chair Ruckelshaus reconvened the meeting.

## **MEETING DATES - 1999 AND 2000**

The Chair directed Board members to the proposed calendar of meetings for the remainder of 1999 and all of 2000 (Tab 2 in meeting materials).

John Roskelly **moved approval** of SRFB Resolution #99-05 adopting meeting dates for the remainder of 1999:

|                    |                        |
|--------------------|------------------------|
| Friday, October 15 | Board Meeting (Yakima) |
|--------------------|------------------------|

|                        |                         |
|------------------------|-------------------------|
| Wednesday, November 17 | Board Meeting (Olympia) |
|------------------------|-------------------------|

|                    |                        |
|--------------------|------------------------|
| Friday, December 3 | Board Meeting (SeaTac) |
|--------------------|------------------------|

Brenda McMurray **seconded. MOTION CARRIED** (Resolution #99-05)

Larry Cassidy **moved approval** of meeting dates for January, February, and March, 2000:

|                    |                         |
|--------------------|-------------------------|
| Friday, January 21 | Board Meeting (Spokane) |
|--------------------|-------------------------|

|                       |                           |
|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| Thursday, February 17 | Board Workshop or Tour    |
| Friday, February 18   | Board Meeting (Bremerton) |

|                    |                           |
|--------------------|---------------------------|
| Thursday, March 16 | Board Workshop or Tour    |
| Friday, March 17   | Board Meeting (Wenatchee) |

John Roskelley seconded. **MOTION CARRIED** (Resolution #99-06)

## **FORESTS AND FISH PROGRAM - ISSUES**

Curt Smith, Governor's Special Assistant for Natural Resources, introduced panelists who had been involved in negotiating the Fish and Forestry Agreement:

Nels Hanson  
Bill Wilkerson, Executive Director  
Dick Wallace  
Amy Bell  
Jim Cahill, Budget Analyst for NR

Small Farm Forestry Association  
WA Forest Protection Association  
Department of Ecology  
Department of Natural Resources  
Office of Financial Management

Mr. Smitch explained that the Timber, Fish and Wildlife agreement, adopted in 1987, was developed out of a major disagreement among private forest land owners, the tribes and federal, state and local agencies about how to manage private forest lands in the state. He discussed goals and riparian strategies and provided a summary of issues and activities (see meeting materials). The agreement passed by the 1999 legislature:

- Placed the agreement in statute
- Encouraged the Forest Practices Board to support the agreement and gave the Board emergency rule power to move the agreement forward
- Created a small landowner fund and small landowner office within DNR
- Provided funding for channel migration zones
- Provided exemptions for very small landowners (not supported by federal agencies)
- Reduced liability for wood placement
- Provided a tax credit for timber companies.

Mr. Smitch explained the budget as approved by the legislature and signed by the Governor (see meeting materials). He also reported that latest estimates of federal funding will be \$18 million (\$20 million less 10% for tribes).

Jim Cahill explained that the Small Landowner Easement Purchases (\$10 million per biennium) and the CMER funds (\$1,471,000) will probably be eliminated from the budget leaving a biennium shortfall of approximately \$10.5 million per biennium. Agencies will carefully consider a budget request before coming to the SRFB. It is also the intent of the partners to prepare a supplemental budget request for the 2000 legislature.

Panelists emphasized:

- providing funding for the work under this agreement would eliminate the need to provide dollars for projects on 8 million acres of private forest lands in the state.
- Modeling exercises of fish-bearing and non-fish-bearing streams met the goal of providing better habitat for salmon
- The agreement is comprehensive and complex ; it is both prevention and restoration (fixing roads, culverts, etc.)
- Nationally this is the first time ESA and CWA accomplished –
- Strong partnership between state agencies and federal agencies

Chair Ruckelshaus encouraged panelists to review and comment on the Board's draft guidelines and criteria and try to determine if the activities under the agreement will be eligible to compete.

Mr. Smitch reported that the Governor's Salmon Recovery Office (GSRO) will soon begin a similar process with the agricultural community and encouraged the Board to develop an approach to statewide agreements and initiatives.

Jim Kramer suggested that Forest and Fish come to the SRFB as a program rather than a project. The guidelines discussed earlier in the meeting could easily be adapted to allow this to happen.

Nels Hanson explained that small landowners are to be compensated under the program because their lands are typically located at lower elevations where there are more streams and wetlands per square mile than at higher elevations. They are more heavily impacted by streamside rules. Also, the complexity of the rules will mean the hiring of more consultants, thus increasing costs to the landowner. Because of legislative action, the SRFB will be asked to provide funding for this program.

Amy Bell explained that "emergency rules" by the Forest Practices Board will place well over half of the of the agreed-upon elements into regulation. Wider buffers, road planning, and adaptive management are included in the "emergency rules". Additionally, Ms. Bell reported that the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) has the ability to "front load" the state portion of the funding until March, 2000.

## **UPDATE ON CONGRESSIONAL FUNDING**

Chair Ruckelshaus announced that federal funding for salmon recovery is in conference committee (see meeting materials).

## **BOARD APPEARANCES AND COMMUNICATION**

The Chair encouraged Board members to make public appearances, particularly with those groups that are associated with salmon and/or salmon recovery. In addition, it would be helpful to translate any concerns about Board activities to other members. Brenda McMurray suggested Board members coordinate public appearance requests through Jim Fox so that efforts won't be duplicated and background information can be provided.

## **DRAFT DOCUMENTS FOR PUBLIC REVIEW (discussion continued)**

Jim Kramer suggested draft document language regarding "best science" remain general in nature until public comment and agency input can be obtained. He reminded Board members that a funding approach and possible legislative recommendations for programs should be developed by the end of the year. In the interim, program funding would be considered on an ad hoc basis.

In response to a question, Mr. Kramer explained that that a scientific review of the of the criteria would probably take place simultaneously with the public comment period.



## DOT REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL FUNDING

Jim Fox explained that the Fish Passage Task Force is requesting Board approval of the process to approve additional funds for five inventory projects (see meeting materials). DOT and WDFW help administer the funds and manage the projects. Staff recommends the Board forward this request to the IRT for review. Members of the IRT have agreed to address this recommendation before the October 15<sup>th</sup> meeting.

John Roskelley **moved** approval of the staff recommendation that the five (5) inventory projects seeking additional funding be referred to the IRT for analysis to develop a recommendation to the SRFB for the October 15, 1999 meeting. Jim Peters **seconded**. **MOTION CARRIED** (SRFB Resolution #99-07)

## PUBLIC COMMENTS

Chair Ruckelshaus called for public testimony.

Michael Kaputa      Salmon Recovery Coordinator, Chelan County and  
Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board  
Thanked the Board for its commitment and time. Distributed maps of Chelan County and the WRIAs located within the County. Urged Board support for planning and studies and responded to questions regarding the Icicle River Barrier Dam.

Judith Noble      ESA Watershed Coordinator for Green/Duwamish River  
City of Seattle  
Urged Board support for projects with degraded, as well as pristine, habitats.

Chair Ruckelshaus thanked Board members and Jeff Breckel from the Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board for the tour.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

SRFB APPROVAL:

---

William Ruckelshaus, Chair

---

Date

Future Meetings:      October 14-15, 1999 (Yakima)  
November 3, 1999 (Olympia)